

Examining the effect of group prototypes and divergent strength of identification on the effectiveness of identity appeals

McGowan, Miriam; Hassan, Louise; Shiu, Edward

DOI:

[10.1108/EJM-04-2020-0260](https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-04-2020-0260)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

McGowan, M, Hassan, L & Shiu, E 2022, 'Examining the effect of group prototypes and divergent strength of identification on the effectiveness of identity appeals', *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 817-839. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-04-2020-0260>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.



Examining the effect of group prototypes and divergent strength of identification on the effectiveness of identity appeals

Journal:	<i>European Journal of Marketing</i>
Manuscript ID	EJM-04-2020-0260.R4
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	prototypicality, affective social identity, cognitive social identity, self-motives, hope, emotion, construal level theory, identity-linking messages

1
2
3 **Examining the effect of group prototypes and divergent strength of identification on the**
4 **effectiveness of identity appeals**
5
6
7
8
9

10 **Purpose** - Past research argues that identity-linking messages must utilise established
11 descriptors of the social group (i.e. prototypical identity appeals) to be effective. We show
12 that less established descriptors (i.e. identity-linking messages low in prototypicality) can be
13 optimal for an important customer segment, namely for those that affectively identify with
14 the social group. This is due to the distinct self-motives underlying the cognitive and
15 affective social identity dimensions.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Design/methodology/approach** – A pilot and two experimental studies were conducted,
24 using gender and nationality as the target identities.
25
26
27

28 **Findings** – Consumers feel more hopeful and have higher purchase intention for products
29 advertised using identity depictions that fit with their predominant (uncertainty-reduction or
30 self-enhancement) self-motive. Consumers predominantly high in affective/cognitive social
31 identity prefer identity-linking messages that are low/high in prototypicality. An abstract
32 mindset reverses these effects by encouraging a similarity focus.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Practical implications** – Adverts utilising established descriptors of a brand's target social
41 group may no longer fit the brand's positioning. Understanding when, and when not, to use
42 less established group descriptors to market brands is important for practitioners.
43
44
45
46

47 **Originality/value** - This is the first research to explore the conditions under which priming
48 consumers' identity using less/more established (i.e. low/high in prototypicality) descriptors
49 has a beneficial, or detrimental, effect on consumers' purchase intention. In understanding
50 these effects, we draw on consumers' self-motives underlying cognitive and affective
51 identification, a distinction not yet made in the identity-linking communications literature.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 We also explore the mediating role of hope – a central motivating emotion – in identity
4
5 marketing.
6
7

8 **Keywords:** prototypicality, affective social identity, cognitive social identity, self-motives,
9
10 hope, emotion, construal level theory, identity-linking messages
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Examining the effect of group prototypes and divergent strength of identification on the effectiveness of identity appeals

1. Introduction

Identity-linking strategies are commonly used in marketing communications to connect with consumers and break through the clutter (e.g., Coleman and Williams, 2015). Brands using this strategy link themselves or their product to consumers' social identity (hereafter SI; e.g., British, vegetarians). For example, brands may suggest that their core customers hold a specific identity (e.g., Patagonia might portray their core customers as environmentalists). Traditionally, brands taking an identity-linking communications strategy would focus on portraying the identity by using well-established descriptions (e.g., Patagonia might link their brand to consumers' concern regarding climate change). However, recent trends in advertising show brands moving away from established descriptors of consumers' identities (Grau and Zotos, 2016). In a recent example, Under Armour has intentionally stirred online debate with its 'I will what I want' campaign, showing Gisele Bündchen, a former Victoria's Secret model, engaging in a strenuous workout. The campaign aims to reassure women that they do not have to embody well-established female descriptors to succeed. In this example, women are celebrated as athletic and tough, rather than merely beautiful.

The aim of the current research is to test whether this novel use of less well-established group descriptors is an effective identity-linking strategy. In the current research, we define highly prototypical descriptors as those that conform to well-established perceptions about the social group (e.g., *caring* women); whereas descriptors that are low in prototypicality represent less well-established perceptions about the social group (e.g., *rebellious* women). Recent campaigns, such as by Under Armour, suggest that managers believe group descriptors that are low (as opposed to high) in prototypicality to be equally – if not better – able to boost sales. However, research has yet to establish if such an identity-

1
2
3 linking strategy is indeed effective, or to shed light on when and why such a strategy might
4
5 work.
6
7

8 Overall, there is a paucity of research on when and why identity-linking messages are
9
10 not effective. In particular, the current research contributes to identity literature by
11
12 challenging the assumption that highly prototypical group descriptors always evoke desirable
13
14 responses in consumers. It also challenges practitioners' assumption that group descriptors
15
16 low in prototypicality represent a desirable identity-linking communication strategy in
17
18 today's marketplace. Specifically, our findings show that the degree (high vs. low) of
19
20 prototypicality is important, because it induces different levels of hopefulness felt by
21
22 consumers when they respond to the group descriptor. Critically, these divergent effects
23
24 depend on consumers' level of cognitive and affective SI which are associated with different
25
26 underlying self-motives, uncertainty-reduction and self-enhancement respectively. Cognitive
27
28 SI refers to consumers' perception of the connection between their self-definition and that of
29
30 the group, whereas affective SI captures consumers' (positive) feelings about their oneness
31
32 with the group (Johnson *et al.*, 2012; Wolter and Cronin, 2016). Our research shows that only
33
34 when a message is congruent with consumers' self-motive, will it evoke hope. In particular,
35
36 consumers who rate predominantly high on affective SI report greater hope and higher
37
38 purchase intention for messages that are low (vs. high) in prototypicality. However,
39
40 consumers who rate predominantly high on cognitive SI report lower hope and purchase
41
42 intention for messages that are low (vs. high) in prototypicality. Drawing on construal level
43
44 theory (CLT), we further show that an abstract mindset reverses these effects by encouraging
45
46 a similarity focus. Our findings therefore build on and extend McGowan *et al.*'s (2019) work,
47
48 which has previously linked identity research and CLT.
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Extant literature provides a good understanding of consumers who overall identify
56
57 strongly (vs. weakly) with their identity. However, it does not explore consumers who
58
59
60

1
2
3 predominantly rate highly on only one SI dimension, which is the focus of the current
4
5 research. Furthermore, extant literature does not account for how the distinct self-motives
6
7 associated with cognitive SI and affective SI differentially influence consumers' response to
8
9 identity-linking messages that depict group descriptors high, or low, in prototypicality. Our
10
11 research is the first to explicate and account for the differential effects of cognitive SI and
12
13 affective SI on consumers' response to identity-linking messages across high and low levels
14
15 of prototypicality. Our findings show that it is not enough to simply distinguish between
16
17 consumers who overall identify strongly versus weakly with the target identity in identity-
18
19 linking messages. Our findings thus suggest that, for example, the campaign by Under
20
21 Armour discussed above would have been effective in eliciting hope, and increased purchase
22
23 intentions, for consumers predominantly high in affective SI, but less effective for consumers
24
25 high in cognitive SI, unless a similarity focus was primed.
26
27
28
29

30
31 We further contribute to identity literature by introducing hope as an important
32
33 mediator, through which identity-linking messages impact purchase intention. According to
34
35 Reed and Forehand (2016, p. 97), "(t)here has been very little work specifically linking
36
37 emotions to identity", and hope in particular, has not yet been examined as an emotional
38
39 response to identity-linking messages. This is surprising as both the use of consumers'
40
41 identity, and eliciting emotions such as hope, are common and highly effective in advertising.
42
43 In particular, Rossiter and Percy (1991, p. 103) asserted that "all ads make a 'promise' and
44
45 thereby invoke hope" with emotions playing a central role in advertising (Poels and Dewitte,
46
47 2019) where hope is commonly evoked (e.g., by suggesting products help achieve a desired
48
49 outcome; MacInnis and de Mello, 2005). The underlying rationale is that consumers who feel
50
51 hope believe that a desirable outcome is feasible and consequently are willing to invest effort
52
53 to achieve the desired outcome (MacInnis and de Mello, 2005). In sum, hope motivates
54
55 behavioural outcomes, such as purchase intention. Yet, little is known about when and how
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 identity-linking messages trigger hope (Reed and Forehand, 2016). We contribute to this
4
5 literature by evidencing the important mediating role of hope that leads to positive outcomes
6
7 such as purchase intention.
8
9

10
11 We now discuss our theoretical framework before outlining our pilot and two
12
13 experimental studies. Finally, we provide a discussion of the overall findings across the
14
15 studies, including an overview of the implications and limitations arising from this research.
16
17

18 19 **2. Theoretical background and hypotheses development**

20 21 22 *2.1. Dimensions of identification and their underlying self-motives*

23
24
25 The two theories of identification, social identity theory and self-categorization theory,
26
27 suggest that two core self-motives underpin social identification; namely, self-uncertainty
28
29 (i.e. subjective uncertainty regarding one's place in the social environment) and self-
30
31 enhancement (e.g., Hogg, 2000). Across the organisational psychology field, the uncertainty-
32
33 reduction motive and self-enhancement motive have been associated with cognitive SI and
34
35 affective SI respectively (Johnson *et al.*, 2012; Reid and Hogg, 2005; Wolter and Cronin,
36
37 2016). Further, these SI dimensions are meaningfully distinct and provide incremental
38
39 predictions over the most commonly used unidimensional measure of identification (Johnson
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
et al., 2012).

We argue that consumers predominantly high in cognitive SI regarding a particular
social group identify with the group as a means to reduce self-uncertainty, whereas
consumers predominantly high in affective SI identify with the group to self-enhance. The
distinct self-motives associated with cognitive/affective SI help explain why the two SI
dimensions may predict divergent consumer behaviours (Wolter and Cronin, 2016). In
particular, we propose that these self-motives can lead to diverse appraisals of identity-

1
2
3 linking messages, making such messages more or less effective in evoking hope. McGowan
4
5 *et al.* (2017) provided a critique of past conceptualisations of the SI construct and confirmed
6
7 the need to take account of the distinctive roles of the cognitive and affective SI dimensions.
8
9 Although not in a communications context, McGowan *et al.* (2017) found the processes
10
11 underlying the effects of these two SI dimensions on purchase intention to differ, highlighting
12
13 the need to model these two SI dimensions separately. For the purpose of our current
14
15 research, we distinguish between uncertainty-reducers and self-enhancers.
16
17
18
19

20 Uncertainty-reducers refers to people who perceives a high degree of overlap between
21
22 themselves and the group definition (i.e. high cognitive SI), but who do not feel positive
23
24 about their membership in the group (i.e. low affective SI). Self-enhancers refers to people
25
26 who do not perceive a high degree of overlap between themselves and the group definition
27
28 (i.e. low cognitive SI), but who feel positive about their membership in the group (i.e. high
29
30 affective SI).
31
32
33

34 The uncertainty-reduction motive arises from individuals' desire to hold correct
35
36 attitudes and to behave correctly in social situations (Hogg, 2000). Thus, individuals may
37
38 experience subjective uncertainty in social environments if similar others appear to hold
39
40 attitudes, emotions, or views different to oneself (Hogg, 2000). For instance, a football fan
41
42 who thinks the club coach is doing a good job may feel unsure about being a 'real' fan if fan
43
44 groups consistently express strong criticisms of the coach. To reduce the resulting subjective
45
46 uncertainty, the football fan will likely align themselves with the group's more negative view
47
48 of the club coach. In other words, the fan aligns themselves with the group's prototypes, as
49
50 subjective uncertainty can be "effectively reduced by self-categorization in terms of a well-
51
52 defined, consensual, and clearly prescriptive ingroup prototype" (Hogg, 2000, p. 233).
53
54
55

56
57 Prototypes refer to group descriptors, which describe and prescribe how group members
58
59 should think, feel, and act (Turner *et al.*, 1987). For instance, amongst Lego consumers there
60

1
2
3 is a consensus that Lego products help users express their creativity. Individuals who adhere
4
5 to ingroup prototypes can be confident that they are behaving correctly or appropriately for
6
7 their group. It follows that group prototypes are key to reducing or protecting against self-
8
9 related uncertainties (Hogg *et al.*, 2010). Uncertainty-reducers are particularly motivated to
10
11 conform to ingroup prototypes to avoid subjective uncertainty. This is because uncertainty-
12
13 reducers' sense of self strongly overlaps with the social group, and they have internalised its
14
15 prototypes (Wolter and Cronin, 2016). Consequently, uncertainty-reducers are particularly
16
17 sensitive to changes to what their group stands for, i.e. changes to the prototypes associated
18
19 with their group (Wolter and Cronin, 2016).
20
21
22
23

24
25 Research also shows that, in general, people identify with groups that offer
26
27 opportunities to maintain or enhance their self-esteem (Branscombe *et al.*, 1999). Affective
28
29 SI therefore reflects the fact that consumers identify with groups to achieve or maintain a
30
31 positive self-evaluation, in other words as a means of self-enhancement (Reid and Hogg,
32
33 2005; Wolter and Cronin, 2016). Moreover, research shows that consumers can satisfy self-
34
35 enhancement needs without cognitively identifying strongly with the social group. These
36
37 consumers do so through feeling positive emotions, such as pride, about a social group,
38
39 thereby basking in the group's reflected glory (Cialdini *et al.*, 1976; Kessler and Hollbach,
40
41 2005). Consumers strategically use brands to satisfy their self-enhancement motive, as
42
43 desired brand associations can 'rub off' on them. For example, carrying a Victoria's Secret
44
45 shopping bag can make female consumers feel more glamorous, good looking, and feminine
46
47
48
49 (Park and John, 2010).
50
51

52 53 2.2 Hypotheses development for Study 1

54
55 Past research has focused predominantly on cognitive and conative outcomes of identity-
56
57 linking messages, such as attitude and purchase intention (e.g., Feiereisen *et al.*, 2009;
58
59
60

1
2
3 McGowan *et al.*, 2019), rather than specific emotions. In contrast, this research focuses on an
4
5 understudied emotion, that of hope (arising from viewing an advertisement). Hope is a future-
6
7 oriented and positively valenced emotion, caused by an uncertain but possible future goal-
8
9 congruent outcome (Frijda *et al.*, 1989; MacInnis and de Mello, 2005). An outcome is
10
11 appraised as goal-congruent, when it is thought to help achieve a desired end or prevent an
12
13 undesired end (Lazarus, 1991). Thus, marketing communications signalling that it is possible
14
15 to achieve goal-congruent outcomes induce hope (MacInnis and de Mello, 2005). In the
16
17 present context, an identity-linking message is expected to evoke hope if it utilises a group
18
19 descriptor consistent with consumers' self-motive.
20
21
22

23
24 To illustrate, compare a product advert utilising an identity-linking message with a
25
26 highly prototypical group descriptor (such as 'For women who are caring') or with a group
27
28 descriptor low in prototypicality (such as 'For women who are rebellious'). For uncertainty-
29
30 reducers, the highly prototypical message suggests that the product is aimed at prototypical
31
32 (i.e. caring) women, thus the product offers an opportunity to signal to others that one is a
33
34 prototypical woman. By using a product thus advertised, uncertainty-reducers can align
35
36 themselves with their group's prototypes, thereby reducing subjective uncertainty regarding
37
38 their place in the social environment. Uncertainty-reducers should therefore appraise a
39
40 product advertised with a highly prototypical message as goal congruent, triggering hope.
41
42 However, a product advertised using a tagline low in prototypicality should not help
43
44 consumers align themselves with the group's prototypes. Moreover, use of such a product
45
46 may suggest that one is no longer a typical group member. As a result, uncertainty-reducers
47
48 should not appraise products advertised with messages low in prototypicality as goal
49
50 congruent, which consequently would not evoke high levels of hope.
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 In contrast, self-enhancers are primarily driven by the need for self-enhancement. We
58
59 expect messages using group descriptors low (vs. high) in prototypicality to evoke higher
60

1
2
3 levels of hope in self-enhancers. This is because self-enhancers are more likely to feel that
4 such a message is more aligned with their self-motive. Our reasoning is that self-enhancers'
5 sense of self does not overlap greatly with the group in question, as denoted by the fact that
6 they are low in cognitive SI. As a result, they do not view ingroup prototypes as descriptive
7 of themselves (Spears *et al.*, 1997). If highly prototypical group descriptors are viewed as less
8 descriptive of, and less relevant to, self-enhancers, such descriptors have little utility in
9 increasing their self-esteem. In contrast, a descriptor low in prototypicality likely signals that
10 the group norms are becoming more flexible, attainable and relevant to the self, thus offering
11 the potential to raise self-enhancers' self-esteem. In support, weakly identified consumers
12 have been found to experience an increase in self-esteem after learning that group norms are
13 becoming more flexible (Jetten *et al.*, 2002). Specifically, Jetten *et al.* (2002) find that merely
14 anticipating that the group's prototypes are becoming more flexible, and therefore may
15 become more descriptive of oneself, can raise consumers' collective self-esteem. We would
16 therefore expect messages utilising group descriptors low in prototypicality to evoke higher
17 levels of hope for self-enhancers as they are more goal congruent.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Consumers are not motivated to attend to or elaborate on marketing communications that have little relevance to them. In particular, consumers are unlikely to feel hope if the outcome is not important to them (MacInnis and Chun, 2007). This means that for consumers low on both SI dimensions, product adverts utilising an identity-linking message should not evoke hope, regardless of prototypicality, because such a message is irrelevant to their self-concept. Thus, we would not expect these consumers to report different levels of hope in response to messages high (vs. low) in prototypicality. Lastly, there are mixed findings on whether one self-motive is motivationally primary. While Reid and Hogg (2005) argue that uncertainty-reduction is motivationally primary to self-enhancement, Aguirre-Rodriguez *et al.* (2012) found the opposite to be true. On balance, we do not expect consumers high on

both SI dimensions to report different levels of hope in response to messages high (vs. low) in prototypicality.

In conclusion, we propose a moderation model, whereby cognitive SI and affective SI are independent moderators of the relationship between level of (low vs. moderate vs. high) prototypicality of the group descriptor and hope. There is no evidence in literature that the two SI dimensions interact, and they are often modelled within a hierarchical, cause-effect, structure (e.g., Bagozzi and Dholakia, 2006) thus suggesting that they are independent but related dimensions of SI¹. Drawing together the discussion above, we posit the following:

H1: Cognitive SI and affective SI independently moderate the effect of prototypicality onto hope.

H1a: Uncertainty-reducers will feel more (less) hopeful following an identity-linking message with a group descriptor high (low) in prototypicality.

H1b: Self-enhancers will feel less (more) hopeful following an identity-linking message with a group descriptor high (low) in prototypicality.

2.2.1 Mediating role of hope

Emotions carry within them action tendencies, which denote the readiness to engage in “specific actions to affirm or cope with the emotion” (Bagozzi *et al.*, 1999, p. 184). In particular, higher order emotions such as hope, caused by cognitive appraisals of situations, lead people to act in ways that are beneficial to their well-being (Frijda *et al.*, 1989). As a positive emotion evoked by a goal-congruent outcome, hope is goal directed and associated with an approach action tendency (MacInnis *et al.*, 2004). Specifically, hope provides the motivational energy for consumers to continuously work towards a desired outcome (Ellsworth and Smith 1988; MacInnis *et al.*, 2004). For example, consumers may engage in motivational reasoning (MacInnis and de Mello, 2005) or pathway thinking, whereby consumers plan out particular ways to

1
2
3 meet their goals (Lazarus, 2006). Lastly, hope has also been shown to play an
4
5 important role in the adoption of new products, if consumers hope that innovative
6
7 offerings will help achieve goal-congruent outcomes (Lin *et al.*, 2020). We therefore
8
9 expect consumers feeling more/less hope from viewing the advertisement to report
10
11 higher/lower intentions to purchase the advertised product.
12
13
14

15
16 Taken the discussions above together, we hypothesize that hope mediates the
17
18 relationship between identity-linking messages and purchase intention (see Figure 1).
19
20 In other words, we expect uncertainty-reducers will, as a consequence of feeling more
21
22 (less) hopeful, report higher (lower) levels of purchase intention following an identity-
23
24 linking message with a group descriptor high (low) in prototypicality. Further, self-
25
26 enhancers will, as a consequence of feeling less (more) hopeful, report lower (higher)
27
28 levels of purchase intention following an identity-linking message with a group
29
30 descriptor high (low) in prototypicality.
31
32
33

34 **H2:** Hope mediates the interaction effects hypothesized in *H1* onto purchase
35
36 intention. In particular, cognitive SI and affective SI independently
37
38 moderate the effect of an identity-linking message onto hope, and these
39
40 conditional effects are mediated onto purchase intention via hope.

41
42 Insert Figure 1 about here
43
44
45
46
47

48 2.2.2 Hypotheses development for Study 2

49
50 Hypothesis 1a predicts that identity-linking messages low in prototypicality would not
51
52 be an effective strategy for uncertainty-reducers. Study 2 reverses this negative effect
53
54 by manipulating consumers' level of construal and thus their perception of the group
55
56 descriptor. We argue that placing uncertainty-reducers in an abstract (vs. concrete)
57
58 mindset leads them to perceive the group descriptors as more prototypical, making the
59
60

1
2
3 identity-linking message more attuned to their self-motive. As such manipulating
4
5 consumers' mindset should have a similar effect to manipulating the prototypicality of
6
7 a group descriptor.
8
9

10
11 Construal level theory explains how mental construal affects people's perception of
12
13 objects or events. According to this theory, objects/events can be mentally construed at
14
15 varying levels of abstraction, ranging from concrete representations (e.g., as a mobile phone)
16
17 to relatively abstract ones (e.g., as a communication device; Trope and Liberman, 2010). At
18
19 higher levels of construal, the object/event is represented in terms of its central, enduring, and
20
21 superordinate features (e.g., a communication device); whereas at lower levels of construal,
22
23 the object/event is construed using detailed, subordinate, and context-specific features (e.g., a
24
25 silver iPhone 11; Trope and Liberman, 2010). Moreover, by default, people use concrete
26
27 representations (e.g., Malkoc *et al.*, 2010).
28
29
30
31

32
33 Changes in the level of construal have implications for categorization and
34
35 personal perceptions (McGowan *et al.*, 2019; Trope and Liberman, 2010), as an
36
37 abstract mindset induces a similarity focus. To that effect, consumers in an abstract
38
39 mindset focus on few important features that tie objects/events together, rather than
40
41 emphasizing incidental or context-specific features. For example, a group of young
42
43 Africans, Asians, and Latinos who attend university could be described more
44
45 abstractly as a group of students. Further, when choosing from a large assortment,
46
47 consumers in an abstract mindset perceive the options to be more similar (Henderson,
48
49 2013).
50
51
52

53
54 The similarity focus also applies to intergroup perceptions. For example,
55
56 McGowan *et al.* (2019) found that Americans perceive Canadians, which are a
57
58 dissociative group, to be more similar to Americans when in an abstract (vs. concrete)
59
60

1
2
3 mindset. In particular, the similarity focus induced by an abstract mindset leads
4
5 individuals to categorize objects into broader categories, suggesting they perceive
6
7 social categories as more broadly defined and inclusive (Liberman *et al.*, 2002;
8
9 Wakslak *et al.*, 2006). Thus, the similarity focus induced by an abstract mindset
10
11 should influence consumers to perceive identity-linking messages that are low in
12
13 prototypicality as more prototypical. However, no such shift in perception takes place
14
15 when in a concrete mindset. It follows that in an abstract (vs. concrete) mindset, the
16
17 social group is perceived to be more inclusive and a given group descriptor is
18
19 considered to be more prototypical of the social group. As a result, the group
20
21 descriptor is better able to validate uncertainty reducers' prototypicality and thus
22
23 satisfy their self-motive. Taken together, we expect uncertainty-reducers to experience
24
25 higher levels of hope when in an abstract (vs. concrete) mindset.
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 The similarity focus induced by an abstract mindset should have the opposite
33
34 downstream effect on hope for self-enhancers. Specifically, the more prototypical a
35
36 given group descriptors is seen to be, the less self-enhancers are able to satisfy their
37
38 need to self-enhance. Therefore, we propose that self-enhancers, when placed in an
39
40 abstract (vs. concrete) mindset, will appraise an identity-linking message using a
41
42 group descriptor low in prototypicality as more prototypical of the social group. It
43
44 follows that, when placed in an abstract (vs. concrete) mindset, self-enhancers should
45
46 appraise the message as less goal congruent and thus experience lower levels of hope.
47
48
49

50
51 **H3a:** Uncertainty-reducers will feel more (less) hopeful following an identity-
52
53 linking message low in prototypicality in an abstract (concrete) mindset.

54
55 **H3b:** Self-enhancers will feel less (more) hopeful following an identity-linking
56
57 message low in prototypicality in an abstract (concrete) mindset.
58
59
60

2.5 Studies overview

We test our hypotheses across two experimental studies and a pilot study. Study 1 examines our proposition that consumers experience higher levels of hope and report stronger purchase intention for a product advertised using a message that is congruent with their predominant self-motive. A moderately prototypical group descriptor was also included in Study 1, to test whether it mirrors the effects observed for messages high or low in prototypicality. This is because prototypes are fuzzy (Reid and Hogg, 2005), meaning marketing managers may inadvertently use group descriptors that consumers consider to be moderately prototypical.

Study 1 tests the hypothesis *H1* with an additive multiple moderation model, whereby cognitive SI and affective SI are independent moderators of the relationship between message prototypicality and hope (see Figure 1). We utilize PROCESS Model 9 (Hayes, 2017) to establish the mediating role of hope, as specified in *H2*. This model stipulates that cognitive SI and affective SI independently moderate the effect of prototypicality on hope. The model thus quantifies the conditional effect of prototypicality on hope at varying combinations of the levels of cognitive SI and affective SI. This allows us to explore the conditional effect for participants high on only one SI dimension, as specified in *H1a* and *H1b*. The pilot study tests our argument, whereby an abstract mindset alters consumers' perception of how prototypical a particular group descriptor is. Based on the findings of this pilot study, Study 2 manipulates participants' level of construal to test hypotheses *H3a* and *H3b*.

3. Study 1

3.1. Pretests

1
2
3 Prior to the main study, which uses gender as the target SI, an initial pretest was conducted to
4 identify a gender-neutral product, to ensure that the chosen product would not confound the
5 results. Perceived gender fit of the product was measured (7=extremely female; 1=extremely
6 male). Fifty seven US women were recruited through MTurk and evaluated a number of
7 products thought to have no prior association with gender. The products being evaluated were a
8 silver coloured digital camera, cotton buds, wrist watch, and headphones. The silver camera was
9 seen as the most gender-neutral product ($M_{\text{camera}} = 3.64$, $M_{\text{cotton buds}} = 4.40$, $M_{\text{watch}} = 2.46$,
10 $M_{\text{headphones}} = 3.61$) and used in the main study.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 In a later separate pretest, 51 US women were recruited through MTurk and asked to
23 evaluate six taglines for the identity-linking message, designed to highlight positive descriptions
24 of women, while allowing for variations in perceived prototypicality. The descriptions were
25 taken from literature on gender stereotypes², which compares women and men on two
26 dimensions. The first dimension revolves around competency, agency, and individualism, while
27 the second dimension revolves around warmth, communality, and collectivism (e.g., Judd *et al.*,
28 2005). Women tend to be characterised as warm and communal, descriptions that are regarded
29 as socially desirable (e.g., Fiske *et al.*, 2007; White and Gardner, 2009). Drawing on this
30 literature, participants read six taglines describing women as either compassionate, assertive,
31 rebellious, caring, loving, or dominant. Participants then rated the perceived prototypicality of
32 each tagline (1=not at all descriptive; 7=very descriptive).

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 Using a repeated measures ANOVA, caring was shown to be the most descriptive of
49 women ($M = 5.31$, $SD = 1.53$), assertive was rated closest to the overall mean value across the
50 six taglines ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 1.47$), whereas rebellious was perceived to be the least descriptive
51 ($M = 2.06$, $SD = 1.50$; $F(2, 100) = 42.90$, $p < .001$). To demonstrate the monotonic increase in
52 prototypicality across the conditions, planned contrasts revealed differences between rebellious
53 and assertive ($F(1, 50) = 4.34$, $p < .001$) and between assertive and caring ($F(1, 50) = 11.17$, $p <$

.01). Finally, participants indicated how sexist the six attributes were (1=not at all; 7=very much), revealing no difference ($F(2, 100) = 2.03, p = .14$). Importantly, caring, assertive, and rebellious were equally low in perceived sexism ($M_{\text{caring}} = 2.73; M_{\text{assertive}} = 2.33; M_{\text{rebellious}} = 2.84$). Caring, assertive, and rebellious were therefore used in the main study as group descriptors for the conditions high, moderate, and low in prototypicality respectively.

3.2. Participants and procedure

A total of 190 US female MTurk workers ($M_{\text{age}} = 41$) took part in a between-subjects experiment with three levels for the manipulation (Prototypicality: low vs. moderate vs. high); cognitive and affective identification with being female was measured prior to the manipulation. Participants saw a camera advert with the tagline ‘We capture your passions’, adding ‘For women who are rebellious’ (prototypicality: low; $N=66$), ‘For women who are assertive’ (prototypicality: moderate; $N=57$) or ‘For women who are caring’ (prototypicality: high; $N=67$). The remainder of the advert was held constant, while the brand name was fictitious to avoid pre-existing brand associations.

3.3. Measures and analysis

Cognitive SI ($\alpha = .88$; Johnson *et al.*, 2012, see Table 1 for all items), affective SI ($\alpha = .94$; Johnson *et al.*, 2012), hope (single item; adapted from Frijda *et al.*, 1989), purchase intention ($\alpha = .95$; adapted from White *et al.*, 2012), and the perceived fit of the group descriptors with the product were captured on seven-point Likert response scales. The group descriptors were seen to fit the product equally well ($M_{\text{caring}} = 4.54, SD = 1.70; M_{\text{assertive}} = 4.19, SD = 1.64; M_{\text{rebellious}} = 4.49, SD = 1.59; F(2,187) = .80, p = .45$).

PROCESS Model 9 (Hayes, 2017; 5,000 bootstrap samples, 95%CI) tested the proposed model. Cognitive SI and affective SI were simultaneously analysed as moderators at different levels of each SI dimension. Indicator coding is used to compare the conditions low in

1
2
3 prototypicality versus moderately prototypical, and the conditions low versus high in
4
5 prototypicality.
6
7

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INSERT Table 1 about here

3.4. Results

Overall, affective SI had a simple effect onto hope ($B = .99, t = 2.70, p = .01$), but cognitive SI ($p = .06$) and prototypicality did not ($p = .97$). When comparing the low versus high prototypicality conditions, the interaction effect of cognitive SI and prototypicality on hope was significant ($B = 1.04, t = 2.31, p = .02$), as was the interaction between affective SI and prototypicality ($B = -.95, t = -2.13, p = .03$). *H1* is thus supported. Further, in support of *H1a*, uncertainty-reducers reported higher levels of hope in the high (vs. low) prototypicality condition ($B = 2.30, t = 2.52, p = .01$). In support of *H1b*, self-enhancers felt more hopeful in the low (vs. high) prototypicality condition ($B = -1.66, t = -2.04, p = .04$). See Figure 2 for a visual depiction with cognitive SI and affective SI at high (84th percentile) and low (16th percentile) levels respectively. Finally, participants high on both SI dimensions ($p = .21$) and low on both dimensions ($p = .95$) felt similarly hopeful following a message high (vs. low) in prototypicality. See Table 2 for an overview of the results.

Figure 2 shows similar results for the moderately and highly prototypical conditions (see Appendix A for the comparison between the moderately and highly prototypical conditions). Additional comparisons of the moderately and highly prototypical conditions revealed no interaction effects between prototypicality and cognitive SI ($p = .73$) or between prototypicality and affective SI ($p = .34$). As discussed further in the General Discussion, this finding is reassuring for marketers.

INSERT Table 2 about here

INSERT Figure 2 about here

The results also show that hope had a positive direct effect onto purchase intention ($B = .55, t = 11.27, p < .001$), but prototypicality did not ($p = .62$). The proposed conditional indirect effect through hope was significant as the index of partial moderated mediation is significant with cognitive SI (index: $.58, CI [.06, 1.17]$) and affective SI (index: $-.53, CI [-1.02, -.08]$) as the moderator. Consistent with $H2$, when comparing the conditions low versus high in prototypicality conditions, mediation occurred for uncertainty-reducers ($B = 1.27, CI [.29, 2.39]$) and for self-enhancers ($B = -.92, CI [-1.97, -.01]$).

With the significant indirect effects evidenced, and as no direct effect of prototypicality on purchase intention was found, the hypothesized mediating role of hope (i.e. $H2$) is supported. This means that uncertainty-reducers (self-enhancers) reported higher levels of hope and purchase intention when they saw an identity-linking message high (low) in prototypicality. Given that hope did not differ across prototypicality conditions when SI dimensions were either both high or both low, we did not expect hope to mediate the effect of prototypicality onto purchase intention. In support, the conditional indirect effect was not significant for participants high ($CI [-.24, 1.01]$) and low on both SI dimensions ($CI [-.58, .52]$). Overall, the model explained 41% of the variance in purchase intention.

4. Study 2

4.1. Pretest

A pretest was conducted to identify a tagline that would be perceived as low in prototypicality for Americans, the target identity. We identified a number of descriptors on the basis of online searches on descriptions that were typical of different nationalities. The author team discussed and generated a list of descriptions less frequently associated with being American, as the basis for the pretest. A sample of 40 US MTurk workers (25% Female; $M_{age} = 35$) rated how descriptive (1=not at all, 7=very much) a number of descriptors are of Americans. These

1
2
3 descriptors included dependable ($M = 4.77$, $SD = 1.57$), creative ($M = 4.74$, $SD = 1.57$),
4
5 generous ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 1.75$), selfless ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 1.83$), sophisticated ($M = 3.61$, $SD =$
6
7 1.36), passionate about fine food ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 1.75$), and curious about other cultures ($M =$
8
9 3.35 , $SD = 1.61$). We identified ‘curious about other cultures’ as low in prototypicality, with a
10
11 one-sample t-test yielding a significant difference from the scale mid-point ($M = 4$; $t(39) = -$
12
13 2.55 , $p = .02$). Thus, the tagline ‘Americans are curious about other cultures – MLE helps you
14
15 discover the world’, for the fictitious brand MLE, was adopted for the main study.
16
17
18

19 20 4.2. Pilot study 21

22
23 A pilot study was conducted to offer an initial test of whether construal level influences how
24
25 prototypical consumers perceive group descriptors to be. Specifically, consumers in an abstract
26
27 (vs. concrete) mindset should perceive a group descriptor to be more prototypical. Sixty seven
28
29 US MTurk workers (45% female, $M_{age} = 35$) took part in a single factor between-subjects
30
31 design, with level of construal being manipulated (Construal level: coded 0 = how/concrete vs. 1
32
33 = why/abstract) in line with Freitas *et al.* (2004). These authors showed that when individuals
34
35 are primed to think repeatedly in terms of “why”, superordinate, abstract thoughts are activated;
36
37 whereas, subordinate, concrete thinking is activated when individuals are primed to think
38
39 repeatedly in terms of “how”. Participants assigned to the abstract construal condition wrote
40
41 why they would want to maintain and improve their health. Participants assigned to the concrete
42
43 construal condition wrote how they would maintain and improve their health. After the
44
45 manipulation, participants rated how descriptive “curious about other cultures” was of
46
47 Americans (1=not at all, 7=very much). Following the detailed manipulation check procedures
48
49 outlined in Fujita *et al.* (2006), an independent judge, unaware of the conditions, coded each
50
51 participant’s level of construal based on the abstractness of their responses to the why/how
52
53 manipulation. Ratings of each participant’s four responses were summed to create an index of
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 level of construal with a potential range of -4 to 4; whereby higher scores indicate higher levels
4
5 of construal.
6
7

8
9 Level of construal was successfully manipulated, as participants' responses in the
10 abstract construal condition reflected higher levels of construal ($M = 3.09$, $SD = 1.29$) than in
11 the concrete condition ($M = -3.27$, $SD = .98$; $t(65) = -22.73$, $p < 0.001$). As expected, being
12
13 "curious about other cultures" was seen as more descriptive of Americans in the abstract (M
14
15 $= 4.59$, $SD = 1.14$) than the concrete condition ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 1.18$, $t(65) = -2.29$, $p = .03$).
16
17 In further support, the mean descriptiveness of being "curious about other cultures" is above
18
19 the scale midpoint ($M = 4$) in the abstract condition ($t(33) = 3.01$, $p < .01$).
20
21
22
23
24

25 4.3. Main study participants and procedure

26
27 A total of 232 Americans (48% female) took part in a between-subjects MTurk experiment, with
28
29 two levels for the manipulation (Construal level: concrete coded 0 vs. abstract coded 1);
30
31 cognitive SI and affective SI were measured prior to the CLT manipulation. After being induced
32
33 into an abstract or concrete mindset, all participants saw a message low in prototypicality. Level
34
35 of construal was manipulated as in the Pilot Study, using the same manipulation check. The
36
37 study focuses on participants' identification with being American and participants saw an advert
38
39 for a travel organizer with the pretested tagline. After being randomly assigned to either the
40
41 concrete ($N=114$) or abstract condition ($N=118$), all participants saw the advert with the
42
43 pretested tagline.
44
45
46
47
48

49 4.4. Main study measures and analysis

50
51 For measurement items and associated alpha values see Table 1. Cognitive SI, affective SI and
52
53 purchase intention were measured as in Study 1. A three-item scale captured hope. Level of
54
55 construal was successfully manipulated, as participants' responses reflected higher levels of
56
57 construal in the abstract ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 1.10$) vs. concrete mindset ($M = -3.45$, $SD = .64$;
58
59
60

1
2
3 $t(189.27) = -57.15, p < .001$). PROCESS Model 9 (Hayes, 2017; 5,000 bootstrap samples,
4
5 95%CI) tested the proposed additive moderated mediation model, assessing the moderating
6
7 effects of cognitive SI and affective SI on the relationship between construal level, with hope as
8
9 the mediator, and purchase intention as the outcome variable.
10
11

12 13 4.5. Results

14
15
16 Affective SI had a simple effect onto hope ($B = .55, t = 4.04, p < .001$), but cognitive SI ($p =$
17
18 $.37$) and level of construal did not ($p = .52$). The interaction effect of cognitive SI and level of
19
20 construal on hope was significant ($B = .53, t = 2.57, p = .01$), as was the interaction between
21
22 affective SI and level of construal ($B = -.63, t = -3.23, p < .01$). In support of *H3a*,
23
24 uncertainty-reducers felt more hopeful in the abstract (vs. concrete) condition ($B = 1.90, t =$
25
26 $2.71, p < .01$). In support of *H3b*, self-enhancers felt more hopeful in the concrete (vs.
27
28 abstract) condition ($B = -2.55, t = -3.13, p < .01$). See Figure 3 for a visual depiction of the
29
30 focal findings with full results in Appendix B. The reported levels of hope did not differ
31
32 across the abstract (vs. concrete) conditions for consumers high ($p = .06$), or low ($p = .89$), on
33
34 both SI dimensions.
35
36
37
38
39

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
INSERT Figure 3 about here

43 The mediation results show hope had a positive direct effect onto purchase intention
44
45 ($B = .78, t = 15.46, p < .001$) but level of construal did not ($p = .92$). The proposed
46
47 conditional indirect effect through hope was significant as the index of partial moderated
48
49 mediation was significant with cognitive SI (index: $.41, CI [.07, .74]$) and affective SI (index:
50
51 $-.49, CI [-.83, -.16]$) as the moderator. When comparing the concrete (vs. abstract) conditions,
52
53 mediation occurred for self-enhancers ($B = -1.99, CI [-3.35, -.61]$), and for uncertainty-
54
55 reducers ($B = 1.48, CI [.30, 2.64]$). As expected, the conditional indirect effect was not
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 significant for participants high (CI [-1.02, .04]) or low on both SI dimensions (CI [-.58,
4
5
6 .51]).

7
8
9 The findings support the hypothesized role of construal level in influencing the
10
11 mediating role of hope when consumers are presented with an identity-linking message that is
12
13 low in prototypicality. Uncertainty-reducers reported higher levels of hope and higher
14
15 purchase intention when they were in an abstract (vs. concrete) mindset. This means that the
16
17 negative effect previously observed when uncertainty-reducers encounter an identity-linking
18
19 message low in prototypicality is mitigated. The opposite was true for self-enhancers: they
20
21 reported higher levels of hope and purchase intention when in a concrete (vs. abstract)
22
23 mindset. Overall, the model explained 51% of the variance in purchase intention.
24
25
26

27 **5. General Discussion**

28
29
30
31 The implicit assumption has always been that for identity-linking messages to be effective,
32
33 they must reflect prototypical descriptors of the social group. However, more recently we see
34
35 a trend towards using group descriptors low in prototypicality in advertising. In particular,
36
37 beauty and fashion brands (e.g., Under Armour's 'I will what I want' or H&M's 'She's a
38
39 lady' campaign) have been at the forefront of this, with the stated aim of empowering
40
41 consumers to reject highly prototypical group descriptors. Given current interest in issues
42
43 around inclusivity and empowerment, brands in other sectors are expected to follow suit.
44
45
46 However, the effectiveness of group descriptors low in prototypicality had not previously
47
48 been tested. Study 1 shows that while this strategy is counterproductive for uncertainty-
49
50 reducers, it does evoke greater hope and higher purchase intention in self-enhancers. Study 2
51
52 further shows that an abstract (vs. concrete) mindset can reverse the effects of a low
53
54 prototypicality appeal on hope and purchase intention for both uncertainty-reducers and self-
55
56 enhancers. While most research simply distinguishes between strongly and weakly identified
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 consumers, our findings suggest that there is a need to examine consumers who rate highly on
4
5 only one SI dimension to take into account the underlying self-motives driving identification.
6
7 Our research further evidenced the important mediating role of the emotion of hope, through
8
9 which identity-linked appeals lead to behavioural outcomes, such as purchase intention.
10
11 Previous research on identity-linked marketing had yet to examine the role of hope, while our
12
13 research reveals that hope is an important motivational factor explaining much of the
14
15 variance in purchase intention.
16
17
18
19

20 21 *5.1 Theoretical contribution*

22
23 Which identity-linking messages are effective for uncertainty-reducers and self-enhancers is a
24
25 function of the prototypicality of the group descriptors used in the message and consumers'
26
27 level of construal. The current research therefore makes five interlinked theoretical
28
29 contributions to identity literature.
30
31
32

33
34 First, our research challenges the assumption that identity-linking messages always
35
36 evoke desirable responses in consumers holding the relevant identity. Literature to date has
37
38 found messages to backfire when they impede consumers' agency (Bhattacharjee *et al.*, 2014)
39
40 or evoke self-presentation concerns (Thomas *et al.*, 2015). Our findings suggest another
41
42 boundary condition for the effectiveness of identity-linking messages, namely whether they
43
44 are congruent with consumers' predominant self-motive that drives their distinctive
45
46 identification with social groups. Given the downstream effects evidenced in our research,
47
48 this has important implications for researchers examining identity-linked communications.
49
50 Further, the current research suggests a need to take into account consumers' underlying self-
51
52 motives across the identity marketing domain.
53
54
55
56

57
58 Second, this research shows that highly prototypical group descriptors are not always
59
60 effective. Self-categorisation theory and literature in organisational behaviour has concluded

1
2
3 that group members are motivated to be seen to be prototypical members (Abrams and Hogg,
4 2010) and are more positively inclined towards prototypical group members or exemplars
5 (e.g., Barreto and Hogg, 2017). We show that this is contingent on consumers' predominant
6 self-motive, as highly prototypical group descriptors do not evoke greater hope and purchase
7 intention in self-enhancers. In addition, the results highlight the conditions when using group
8 descriptors low in prototypicality can be effective. Given the diverse results evidenced
9 between uncertainty-reducers and self-enhancers across group descriptors high versus low in
10 prototypicality, identity researchers should assess if the stimuli adopted in identity priming is
11 perceived by participants as high or low in prototypicality.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Third, this research draws on prior work identifying the distinct self-motives driving
26 cognitive versus affective SI (Wolter and Cronin, 2016). While some research accounts for
27 strength of identification being a multidimensional construct, the current findings highlight
28 the importance of accounting for consumers' cognitive and affective SI, the strength of which
29 may differ. Our findings contribute to identity literature by highlighting the importance of
30 accounting for consumers' self-motives. Both studies show that consumers appraise and
31 respond to information in line with their self-motives, resulting in different emotional and
32 behavioural outcomes. The two self-motives are expected to influence how consumers
33 respond to any identity relevant information. Taken together, our findings suggest that it is
34 not sufficient to merely distinguish between consumers who overall identify strongly or
35 weakly with a given identity.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Fourth, our findings contribute to identity literature by introducing hope as a novel
51 mediator through which identity-linking messages affect behaviour. Emotions have always
52 played an important role in SI literature, starting from Tajfel's (1981) definition of SI as
53 holding emotional significance. Emotions may also affect consumers' response to different
54 types of identity-linking messages (e.g., prevention-focus or promotion-focus message
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 appeals, Bang *et al.*, 2017). Despite this, little is known about the specific emotions evoked
4
5 by identity primes. Our research differs from existing work, by drawing on literature on
6
7 identity specific self-motives to examine consumers' response to messages with varying
8
9 levels of prototypicality. Our findings suggest that when one self-motive is dominant, an
10
11 identity-linking message evokes more hope only when the message is attuned to address the
12
13 specific need underlying the self-motive. Past identity research had focused mainly on
14
15 cognitive and behavioural outcomes. There is a need to examine affective outcomes in the
16
17 form of discrete emotions to yield a better understanding of the underlying mechanisms in
18
19 identity research.
20
21
22
23
24

25 Finally, this research brings together the identity and construal level theory literature.
26
27 Specifically, Study 2 shows that messages low in prototypicality can be effective for
28
29 uncertainty-reducers, but only for consumers with an abstract mindset. Identity literature has
30
31 largely ignored the potential influence of construal level on how consumers process and
32
33 respond to information relevant to their identity. An exception is McGowan *et al.* (2019),
34
35 who show that consumers perceive themselves to be more similar to a dissociative group
36
37 when in an abstract, relative to a concrete, mindset. The current research builds on and
38
39 extends this finding, by showing that level of construal alters how prototypical a given group
40
41 descriptor is perceived to be. Specifically, a descriptor is seen as more prototypical when
42
43 consumers are in an abstract mindset, with implications for whether a message is appraised as
44
45 goal-congruent or not, with consequences in boosting or inhibiting hope.
46
47
48
49
50

51 *5.2 Managerial implications*

52
53

54 Given the importance of the level of prototypicality in identity-linking messages, marketing
55
56 managers need to pretest their identity-linked appeals to assess the level of perceived
57
58 prototypicality by their target audiences. Promotional campaigns may have different themes
59
60

1
2
3 that are better in addressing different consumer needs. Consideration thus needs to be given
4
5 as to which self-motive (uncertainty reduction or self enhancement) the promotional
6
7 campaign aims to address. Further, our research shows hope to predict and explain much
8
9 variation (41% in Study 1 and 51% in Study 2) in consumers' purchase intention, raising the
10
11 question of how practitioners can tailor their campaigns to best evoke hope across customer
12
13 segments. Our findings suggest that identity-linking messages containing group descriptors
14
15 low in prototypicality are effective for self-enhancers, but not for uncertainty-reducers, unless
16
17 these latter consumers are placed into an abstract mindset.
18
19
20
21

22 We expect uncertainty-reducers and self-enhancers to represent a sizeable target
23
24 market for a number of reasons. Firstly, for most – if not all – identities, consumers go
25
26 through a developmental phase, whereby they learn about and are motivated to emulate the
27
28 group's prototypes, while interacting with group members (e.g., Cleveland and Xu, 2019). In
29
30 most cases, consumers are likely to differ on the two identity dimensions, based on their
31
32 individual experiences and interactions with their respective social group (Kessler and
33
34 Holbach, 2005). Secondly, factors relating to the social group or consumers' personality may
35
36 result in uneven levels of cognitive SI and affective SI. For example, research on brand-
37
38 identification and company-identification has identified distinct antecedents (e.g., brand
39
40 prestige, brand warmth; memorable experiences, brand distinctiveness) that map onto the
41
42 distinct self-motives of cognitive SI versus affective SI (e.g., Stokburger-Sauer *et al.*, 2012).
43
44 Johnson *et al.* (2012) also find that personality factors, such as extraversion versus
45
46 neuroticism, differentially affect cognitive SI and affective SI.
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Brands that wish to target uncertainty-reducers with messages containing low
54
55 prototypical group descriptors can prime an abstract mindset, to shift the perceived
56
57 prototypicality of said descriptors. In practice, an abstract mindset can be induced in different
58
59 ways. One way is by adopting the 'How' versus 'Why' manipulation used in the current
60

1
2
3 research; for example by asking consumers to 'think about reasons' (vs. 'think about ways') to
4 use the product, which primes an abstract (vs. concrete) mindset (White *et al.*, 2011). Thus,
5
6 by encouraging consumers to engage in a sequence of Q&A, consumers may be induced to
7
8 focus on the similarity between their social group (e.g., gender) and the group descriptor (e.g.
9
10 rebellious women), evoking greater hope in uncertainty-reducers. In contrast, group
11
12 descriptors low in prototypicality offer an effective communication strategy for self-
13
14 enhancers when they are in the default - concrete - mindset (Malkoc *et al.*, 2010). As such,
15
16 managers can be assured that low prototypical descriptors would not normally present a
17
18 problem when targeting self-enhancers. However, managers need be aware that other features
19
20 of the identity-linked message may inadvertently manipulate an abstract mindset, thereby
21
22 reducing the effectiveness of the message. For example, background music (low vs. high
23
24 frequency music; Sunaga, 2018) or the visual imagery of an advert (e.g., filmed far away vs.
25
26 nearby; Fujita *et al.*, 2006) may induce an abstract mindset.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 Our findings illustrate the importance of differentiating uncertainty-reducers and self-
35
36 enhancers, thus emphasising the need for segmentation based on levels of cognitive and
37
38 affective SI amongst the target audience. As such, firms need to track levels of both affective
39
40 SI and cognitive SI within their target audience, as this determines whether group descriptors
41
42 are perceived to be goal congruent and therefore evoke hope. While it may be difficult to
43
44 directly capture the relative strength of cognitive/affective SI, consumers' online and offline
45
46 behaviour may offer circumstantial evidence. For example, consumers holding a Nike+
47
48 membership are likely to hold a runner identity. The more these consumers engage with the
49
50 Nike app, for example by sharing their running statistics online, the more likely they are to
51
52 hold higher levels of cognitive SI. Other consumers who are seen to interact frequently with
53
54 fellow members of the community, which offer affirmation and a sense of community, will
55
56 likely rate high on both cognitive SI and affective SI. In contrast, consumers posting pictures
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of themselves on social media with their new running gear – but who otherwise do not seem
4
5 to engage much with the runner app – likely rate higher on affective SI than cognitive SI.
6
7 Where such data is not available, marketers should undertake an A/B test to examine
8
9 different online adverts that are high versus low in prototypicality, which would provide an
10
11 easy and low-cost way of identifying the most effective approach for each target market
12
13
14 segment.

15
16
17 Finally, Study 1 shows that consumers respond the same to moderately and highly
18
19 prototypical messages. This is important, as group prototypes are fuzzy, potentially blurring
20
21 the line between descriptors moderate to high in prototypicality. This may make it difficult
22
23 for outsiders who do not hold the identity in question to identify the most appropriate group
24
25 descriptor to use in advertising without detailed research. Our findings reassure marketers,
26
27 who may inadvertently use moderately rather than highly prototypical descriptors, that their
28
29 campaign would still be equally effective.
30
31
32

33 34 *5.3 Limitations and future directions*

35
36
37 Future work should examine the role of hope in identity-marketing and explore potential
38
39 boundary conditions. While we capture hope as a unidimensional construct, recent research
40
41 has distinguished between two subdimensions, agency and pathways (e.g., Kelberer *et al.*,
42
43 2018), and between promotion hope versus prevention hope (e.g., Choi *et al.*, 2019). Future
44
45 work should therefore investigate whether consumers at different levels of cognitive SI and
46
47 affective SI would respond differently on these other dimensions of hope. For example, an
48
49 argument could be made that, in line with their self-motive, uncertainty-reducers are more
50
51 likely to experience prevention hope, whereas self-enhancers may experience promotion
52
53
54 hope.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Going forward, given our argument that identity-linking messages low in
4
5 prototypicality are not goal congruent with the self-motive driving uncertainty-reducers,
6
7 future work should examine if and when such depictions low in prototypicality might be
8
9 considered an identity threat. Further, while it is unlikely that marketing managers would
10
11 intentionally use identity cues that are not positive, consumers may nevertheless perceive
12
13 such cues as negative or even derogatory. Future work should test how consumers respond to
14
15 perceived negative descriptors. Self-enhancers would presumably dislike them, because they
16
17 conflict with their self-enhancement need. However, uncertainty-reducers may respond
18
19 favourably, if the descriptor was accepted as highly prototypical, and therefore satisfying
20
21 their need for uncertainty reduction.
22
23
24
25
26

27 A limitation of the current research is that Study 1 only distinguishes between male
28
29 and female but failed to account for additional gender categories, such as non-binary or
30
31 transgender. This binary gender distinction allowed us to draw on stereotype literature, which
32
33 specifically looks at descriptors of females/males, when designing the manipulation.
34
35 However, future research may wish to reflect a more current understanding of gender rather
36
37 than sex assigned at birth. For example, more work is needed to identify which gender related
38
39 descriptors would be considered to be high or low in prototypicality for non-binary
40
41 consumers. In addition, consumers' gender may be fluid, meaning how consumers relate to
42
43 gender-based identity-linking messages is likely to change over time.
44
45
46
47

48 The current research assumes that group descriptors are clearly associated with
49
50 particular genders and that people are aware of these prototypes. However, future research
51
52 should investigate instances in which a particular social group (here gender) is described in
53
54 terms of conflicting group descriptors or instances in which a given group descriptor is
55
56 applicable to different social groups. Finally, the current research assumes that consumers can
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 confidently identify whether a group descriptor is prototypical. Future research may therefore
4
5 wish to use a longitudinal approach to understand how prototypes develop over time.
6
7
8
9

10 11 **Footnotes**

12
13
14 ¹ Using PROCESS Model 3 we verify in Study 1 that cognitive SI and affective SI do not
15
16 interact, nor was there a three-way interaction with the prototypicality condition.
17
18

19
20 ² The terms prototype and stereotype are sometimes used interchangeably in literature.
21
22 Mostly, the term ‘prototype’ is used in self-categorisation theory to denote the specific
23
24 attributes that people associate with ingroups in contrast against outgroups (Abrams and
25
26 Hogg, 2010). However, when people use specific attributes to describe members of an
27
28 outgroup, they engage in stereotyping (Abrams and Hogg, 2010). We draw on stereotyping
29
30 literature because women have been shown to apply the relevant attributes purported to
31
32 describe women by outgroup members, such as men, to themselves (see e.g., Hentschel *et al.*,
33
34 2019).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **References**

- 43
44
45 Abrams, D. and Hogg, M. A. (2010), “Social identity and self-categorization”, in J. F.
46
47 Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. Glick, and V.M. Esses (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of*
48
49 *prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination*, Thousand Oaks, California, SAGE
50
51 Publications, pp. 179-193.
52
53
54 Aguirre-Rodriguez, A., Bosnjak, M. and Sirgy, M.J. (2012), “Moderators of the self-
55
56 congruity effect on consumer decision-making: A meta-analysis”, *Journal of Business*
57
58 *Research*, Vol. 65, pp. 1179-1188.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Bagozzi, R.P. and Dholakia, U.M. (2006), “Antecedents and purchase consequences of
4 customer participation in small group brand communities”, *International Journal of*
5
6 *Research in Marketing*, Vol. 23, pp. 45-61.
7
8
9
10 Bagozzi, R.P., Gopinath, M. and Nyer, P.U. (1999), “The role of emotions in marketing”,
11
12 *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 184-206.
13
14
15 Bang, H., Yoo, J.J. and Choi, D. (2017), “The carryover effect of national identity activation
16 on consumers' evaluations of ads with patriotic appeals”, *Journal of Business Research*,
17
18 Vol. 79, pp. 66-78.
19
20
21 Barreto, N.B. and Hogg, M.A. (2017), “Evaluation of and support for group prototypical
22 leaders: A meta-analysis of twenty years of empirical research”, *Social Influence*, Vol. 12
23
24 No. 1, pp. 41-55.
25
26
27
28 Bhattacharjee, A., Berger, J. and Menon, G. (2014), “When identity marketing backfires:
29 Consumer agency in identity expression”, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 41 No. 2,
30
31 pp. 294-309.
32
33
34
35 Branscombe, N.R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R. and Doosje, B. (1999), “The context and content
36 of social identity threat”, in N. Ellemers, R. Spears, and B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity:*
37
38 *Context, commitment, content*, Oxford, England: Blackwell, pp. 35-58.
39
40
41
42 Choi, T.R., Choi, J.H. and Sung, Y. (2019), “I hope to protect myself from the threat: The
43 impact of self-threat on prevention-versus promotion-focused hope”, *Journal of Business*
44
45 *Research*, Vol. 99, pp. 481-489.
46
47
48
49 Cialdini, R.B., Borden, R.J., Thorne, A., Walker, M.R., Freeman, S. and Sloan, L.R. (1976),
50
51 “Basking in reflected glory: Three (football) field studies”, *Journal of Personality and*
52
53 *Social Psychology*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp. 366–375.
54
55
56 Cleveland, M. and Xu, C. (2019), “Multifaceted acculturation in multiethnic settings”,
57
58 *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 103, pp. 250-260.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Coleman, N.V. and Williams, P. (2015), "Looking for my self: Identity-driven attention
4 allocation", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 504-511.
5
6
7
8 Ellsworth, P.C., and Smith, C.A. (1988), "Shades of joy: Patterns of appraisal differentiating
9 pleasant emotions", *Cognition & Emotion*, Vol. 2 No. 4, pp. 301-331.
10
11
12 Feiereisen, S., Broderick, A. and Douglas, S.P. (2009), "The effect and moderation of gender
13 identity congruity: Utilizing 'real women' advertising images", *Psychology and
14 Marketing*, Vol. 26 No. 9, pp. 813-843.
15
16
17
18 Fiske, S.T., Cuddy, A.J.C. and Glick, P. (2007), "Universal dimensions of social cognition:
19 Warmth and competence", *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 77-83.
20
21
22
23 Freitas, A.L., Gollwitzer, P. and Trope, Y. (2004), "The influence of abstract and concrete
24 mindsets on anticipating and guiding others' self-regulatory efforts", *Journal of
25 Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 40 No. 6, pp. 739-752.
26
27
28
29
30
31 Frijda, N.H., Kuipers, P. and ter Schure, E. (1989), "Relations among emotion, appraisal, and
32 emotional action readiness", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 57 No. 2,
33 pp. 212-228.
34
35
36
37
38 Fujita, K., Trope, Y., Liberman, N. and Levin-Sagi, M. (2006), "Construal levels and self-
39 control", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 90 No. 3, pp. 351-367.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Grau, S.L. and Zotos, Y.C. (2016), "Gender stereotypes in advertising: A review of current
research", *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 35 No. 5, pp. 761-770.
- Hayes, A.F. (2017), *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process
Analysis. A regression-based approach*, New York: Guilford Publications.
- Henderson, M.D. (2013), "When seeing the forest reduces the need for trees: The role of
construal level in attraction to choice", *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol.
49 No. 4, pp. 676-683.

- 1
2
3 Hentschel, T., Heilman, M.E. and Peus, C.V. (2019), "The multiple dimensions of gender
4 stereotypes: A current look at men's and women's characterizations of others and
5 themselves", *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 10 No. 11, pp. 1-19.
6
7
8
9
10 Hogg, M.A. (2000), "Subjective uncertainty reduction through self-categorization: A
11 motivational theory of social identity processes", *European Review of Social Psychology*,
12 Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 223-255.
13
14
15
16 Hogg, M.A., Meehan, C. and Farquharson, J. (2010), "The solace of radicalism: Self-
17 uncertainty and group identification in the face of threat", *Journal of Experimental Social*
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Jetten, J., Branscombe, N.R. and Spears, R. (2002), "On being peripheral: Effects of identity insecurity on personal and collective self-esteem", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 105-123.
- Johnson, M.D., Morgeson, F.P. and Hekman, D.R. (2012), "Cognitive and affective identification: Exploring the links between different forms of social identification and personality with work attitudes and behavior", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 33 No. 8, pp. 1142-1167.
- Judd, C.M., James-Hawkins, L., Yzerbyt, V. and Kashima, Y. (2005), "Fundamental dimensions of social judgment: Understanding the relations between judgments of competence and warmth", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 89 No. 6, pp. 899-913.
- Kelberer, L.J., Kraines, M.A. and Wells, T.T. (2018), "Optimism, hope, and attention for emotional stimuli", *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 124, pp. 84-90.
- Kessler, T. and Hollbach, S. (2005), "Group-based emotions as determinants of ingroup identification", *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 41 No. 6, pp. 677-685.
- Lazarus, R.S. (1991), *Emotion and Adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- 1
2
3 Lazarus, R.S. (2006), "Emotions and interpersonal relationships: Toward a person-centered
4 conceptualization of emotions and coping", *Journal of Personality*, Vol. 74 No. 1, pp. 9-
5
6 46.
7
8
9
- 10 Liberman, N., Sagristano, M.D. and Trope, Y. (2002), "The effect of temporal distance on
11 level of mental construal", *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 38 No. 6, pp.
12 523-534.
13
14
15
- 16 Lin, Y.T., MacInnis, D.J. and Eisingerich, A.B. (2020), "Strong anxiety boosts new product
17 adoption when hope is also strong", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 84 No. 5, pp. 60-78.
18
19
20
- 21 MacInnis, D.J. and Chun, H.E. (2007), "Understanding hope and its implications for
22 consumer behavior: I hope, therefore I consume", *Foundations and Trends in Marketing*,
23 Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 97-189.
24
25
26
- 27 MacInnis, D.J. and de Mello, G.E. (2005), "The concept of hope and its relevance to product
28 evaluation and choice", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 69 No. 1, pp. 1-14.
29
30
31
- 32 MacInnis, D.J., de Mello, G.E. and Patrick, V. (2004), "Consumer hopefulness: Construct,
33 relevance to internet marketing, antecedents and consequences", *International Journal*
34 *Internet Marketing and Advertising*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 174-195.
35
36
37
- 38 Malkoc, S.A., Zauberan, G. and Bettman, J.R. (2010), "Unstuck from the concrete:
39 Carryover effects of abstract mindsets in intertemporal preferences", *Organizational*
40 *Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 113 No. 2, pp. 112-126.
41
42
43
- 44 McGowan, M, Hassan, L.M. and Shiu, E. (2019), "Solving dissociative group effects using
45 construal level theory", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54 No. 1, pp. 212-237.
46
47
48
- 49 McGowan, M., Shiu, E. and Hassan, L.M. (2017), "The influence of social identity on value
50 perceptions and intention", *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 242-253.
51
52
53
- 54 Park, J.K., and John, D.R. (2010), "Got to get you into my life: Do brand personalities rub off
55 on consumers?" *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 655-669.
56
57
58
59
60

- Poels, K. and Dewitte, S. (2019), "The role of emotions in advertising: A call to action", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 48 No. 1, pp. 81-90.
- Reed, A. and Forehand, M.R. (2016), "The ebb and flow of consumer identities: The role of memory, emotions and threats", *Current Opinion in Psychology*, Vol. 10, pp. 94-100.
- Reid, S.A. and Hogg, M.A. (2005), "Uncertainty reduction, self-enhancement, and ingroup identification", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 31 No. 6, pp. 804-817.
- Rossiter, J.R. and Percy, L. (1991), "Emotions and motivation in advertising", in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 18, pp.100-110. Michael R. Solomon, ed. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Spears, R., Doosje, B. and Ellemers, N. (1997), "Self-stereotyping in the face of threats to group status and distinctiveness: The role of group identification", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 23 No. 5, pp. 538-553.
- Stokburger-Sauer, N., Ratneshwar, S. and Sen, S. (2012), "Drivers of consumer-brand identification", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 406-418.
- Sunaga, T. (2018), "How the sound frequency of background music influences consumers' perceptions and decision making", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 35 No. 4, pp. 253-267.
- Tajfel, H. (1981), *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. CUP Archive.
- Thomas, T.C., Trump, R.K. and Price, L.L. (2015), "Advertising as unfavorable self-presentation: The dirty laundry effect", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 58-70.
- Trope, Y. and Liberman, N. (2010), "Construal-level theory of psychological distance", *Psychological Review*, Vol. 117 No. 2, pp. 440-463.
- Turner, J.C., Hogg, M.A., Oakes, P.J., Reicher, S.D. and Wetherell, M.S. (1987), *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Basil: Blackwell.

- 1
2
3 Wakslak, C.J., Trope, Y., Liberman, N. and Alony, R. (2006), "Seeing the forest when entry
4 is unlikely: Probability and the mental representation of events", *Journal of Experimental*
5
6 *Psychology: General*, Vol. 135 No. 4, pp. 641-653.
7
8
9
10 White, J.B. and Gardner, W.L. (2009), "Think women, think warm: Stereotype content
11 activation in women with a salient gender identity, using a modified Stroop task", *Sex*
12
13 *Roles*, Vol. 60 No. 3-4, pp. 247-260.
14
15
16
17 White, K., MacDonnell, R. and Dahl, D.W. (2011), "It's the mind-set that matters: The role of
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- White, K., MacDonnell, R. and Ellard, J.H. (2012), "Belief in a just world: Consumer intentions and behaviors toward ethical products", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 76 No. 1, pp. 103–118.
- Wolter, J.S. and Cronin, J.J. (2016), "Re-conceptualizing cognitive and affective customer–company identification: The role of self-motives and different customer-based outcomes", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 44 No. 3, pp. 397-413.

Appendix A

Study 1 - Conditional effect of prototypicality on hope

Overview of additive multiple moderation model onto hope. To explore the difference between the moderately and highly prototypical conditions we use Helmert coding. Helmert coding first compares the low prototypicality condition to the moderate and high prototypicality conditions jointly, and then compares the moderate to high prototypicality conditions. We only report the comparison of interest here, which is between the moderately and highly prototypical conditions.

Predictor			b	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95%CI
Prototypicality			1.81	.75	.45	-2.95, 6.57
Cognitive SI			.001	.01	.99	-.34, .34
Affective SI			.48	2.63	.01	.12, .85
Prototypicality condition × Cognitive SI			.14	.35	.73	-.63, .91
Prototypicality condition × Affective SI			-.39	-.95	.34	-1.21, .42
	Low	Low Affective	.36	.70	.49	-.67, 1.40
	Cognitive SI	SI				
Self-enhancers	Low	High	-.31	-.42	.68	-1.76, 1.14
	Cognitive SI	Affective SI				
Uncertainty-reducers	High	Low Affective	.67	.82	.41	-.94, 2.28
	Cognitive SI	SI				
	High	High	-.002	-.003	.99	-1.07, 1.06
	Cognitive SI	Affective SI				

NOTE: Low = 16th percentile represents low levels of SI; High = 84th percentile represents high levels of SI

Appendix B

Study 2 - Conditional effect of construal level (CL) on hope

Predictor			b	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95%CI
CL			.42	.65	.52	-.86, 1.71
Cognitive SI			-.14	-.89	.37	-.44, .16
Affective SI			.55	4.04	.000	.28, .81
CL × Cognitive SI			.53	2.57	.01	.12, .94
CL × Affective SI			-.63	-3.23	.001	-1.01, -.24
	Low	Low Affective	-.04	-.13	.89	-.71, .62
	Cognitive SI	SI				
Self-enhancers	Low	High	-2.55	-3.13	.002	-4.16, -.95
	Cognitive SI	Affective SI				
Uncertainty-reducers	High	Low Affective	1.90	2.71	.007	.52, 3.28
	Cognitive SI	SI				
	High	High	-.61	-1.91	.058	-1.24, .02
	Cognitive SI	Affective SI				

NOTE: Low = 16th percentile represents low levels of SI; High = 84th percentile represents high levels of SI; Independent variable: CL (concrete vs. abstract)




Fig. 1. Conceptual model (Study 1)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Fig. 2. Conditional effects of prototypicality on hope (Study 1)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Fig. 3 Conditional effect of construal level on hope (Study 2)

European Journal of Marketing

Table 1.

Measurement items (Study 1 woman; Study 2 American)

Cognitive social identity (Johnson *et al.*, 2012) $\alpha = .88$ (.95)

- Your self-identity is based in part on being a woman (American)
- Being a woman (American) is very important to your sense of who you are
- Your sense of self overlaps with the identity of women (American)

Affective social identity (Johnson *et al.*, 2012) $\alpha = .94$ (.98)

- You feel happy to be a woman (American)
- You are proud to be a woman (American)
- It feels good to be a woman (American)

Hope

- Study 1: Please indicate how much the advert made you feel hopeful (1=Not at all hopeful; 7=Very hopeful; adapted from Frijda *et al.*, 1989)
- Study 2: Please indicate how much the advert made you feel hopeful/inspired/optimistic (adapted from Richins, 1997; Prestin, 2013, $\alpha = .94$)

Purchase intention (adapted from White *et al.*, 2012) $\alpha = .95$ (.93)

- You would be likely to purchase the camera (travel organizer) shown in the advert
- Given the opportunity, you would want to purchase the camera (travel organizer) shown in the advert
- You would not want to purchase the camera (travel organizer) shown in the advert (reversed)

Perceived fit of the tagline with the product; Study 1: $\alpha = .93$

- How well does the tagline fit the advertised camera? (0=not at all well; 6=very well)
- How appropriate do you think the tagline is for the advertised camera? (0=not at all appropriate; 6=very appropriate)

NOTE: All measurement used 7-point response scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree) except where indicated. Study 2 in parenthesis unless otherwise indicated.

Table 2.

Results of additive multiple moderation model onto hope, comparing conditions low vs. high in prototypicality (Study 1)

Predictor	Hope			
	b	t	p	95%CI
Prototypicality condition	.08	.03	.97	-4.85, 5.01
Cognitive SI	-.65	-1.92	.06	-1.31, .02
Affective SI	.99	2.70	.01	.27, 1.71
Prototypicality condition × Cognitive SI	1.04	2.31	.02	.15, 1.93
Prototypicality condition × Affective SI	-.95	-2.13	.03	-1.84, -.07
Self-enhancers				
Low Cognitive SI				
High Affective SI				
Low Cognitive SI	-1.66	-2.04	.04	-3.26, -.06
High Affective SI				
Uncertainty-reducers				
High Cognitive SI	2.30	2.52	.01	.50, 4.10
High Affective SI				
High Cognitive SI	.68	1.26	.21	-.38, 1.74
High Affective SI				

NOTE: Low = 16th percentile represents low levels of SI; High = 84th percentile represents high levels of SI